UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,982	08/29/2003	Nadi Sakir Findikli	PU02 0208US1.39	1981
54494 7590 12/02/2010 MOORE AND VAN ALLEN PLLC FOR SEMC P.O. BOX 13706 430 DAVIS DRIVE, SUITE 500			EXAMINER	
			BALAOING, ARIEL A	
	VE, SULLE 500 IANGLE PARK, NC	27709	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/604,982	FINDIKLI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	ARIEL BALAOING	2617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 Oc</u>	ctober 2010.					
	<u> </u>					
'=	/ _					
·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-11,16-20,26,27,29-33,36-40,43 and 44</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-11,16-20,26,27,29-33,36-40,43 and 44</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	<u> </u>					
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 August 2003</u> is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent (S) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/31/2009 05/14/2010</u> . 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/04/2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 3, 10, 11, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3 and 20, recite the limitation "further comprising receiving an acknowledgement message from the module registration message". However, independent claim 1 and 18 recites "without requiring a response to the registration

Art Unit: 2617

message" on line 14 of claim 1, and line 17 of claim 18. However, as described on paragraph 28 of the specification said acknowledgement is optionally used in the case that conformation is needed before allowing the use of the licensed software. Therefore in the embodiment represented in claim 3 and 20, the licensed software requires a response to the registration message to allow use of the licensed software and is indefinite in view of independent claim 1.

Claims 10 and 11 are indefinite as being dependent on an indefinite parent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by HECKSEL et al (US 6,151,707).

Regarding claim 1, HECKSEL discloses a method of registering a licensed software package in a mobile device (abstract; col. 3, line 47-49), comprising: detecting the licensed software package in a processing platform in the device being accessed by a user of the mobile device (Figures 3a-3c; col. 2, line 7-16, 24-42); allowing use of the licensed software without eventually requiring permission from a server to use the licensed software package (col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 15, col. 4, line 43-59; software registration is used to collect information on a user of a software product. Post registration activity can occur, however, is not necessary for use of registered product);

collecting module parameters (Figures 3a-3c; col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23); assembling a registration message in response to the detecting of the licensed software package has been accessed, the registration message comprising a message to record that the licensed software package has begun to be used (Figures 3a-3c; col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23); and sending the registration message from the device to a module registration system while allowing use of the licensed software package without requiring a response to the registration message (col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23, col. 6, line 47-64).

Regarding claim 16, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. HECKSEL further discloses further comprising selecting a delivery path for the registration message based on a delivery path parameter for the mobile device (col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60).

Regarding claim 17, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. HECKSEL further discloses further comprising selecting a delivery path for the registration message based on a delivery path parameter from among the module parameters (col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60).

Regarding claim 18, HECKSEL discloses a mobile device operable to register a licensed software package included therein (abstract; col. 3, line 47-49), the mobile device comprising: at least one CPU processor configure for: detecting the licensed software package in a processing platform in the device being accessed by a user of the mobile device (Figures 3a-3c; col. 2, line 7-16, 24-42); allowing use of the licensed software without eventually requiring permission from a server to use the licensed

software package (col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 15, col. 4, line 43-59; software registration is used to collect information on a user of a software product. Post registration activity can occur, however, is not necessary for use of registered product); collecting module parameters (Figures 3a-3c; col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23); assembling a registration message in response to the detecting of the licensed software package has been accessed, the registration message comprising a message to record that the licensed software package has begun to be used (Figures 3a-3c; col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23); and sending the registration message from the device to a module registration system while allowing use of the licensed software package without requiring a response to the registration message (col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23, col. 6, line 47-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 3, 5, 6, 8-11, 20, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 36-39, 43, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HECKSEL et al (US 6,151,707) in view of HURST et al (US 2003/0224823).

Regarding claim 3, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose receiving an acknowledgement message from the module registration system. In a

similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses receiving an acknowledgement message from a module registration system (paragraph 59). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow a system to confirm access rights before allowing use of a module.

Regarding claim 5, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the sending of the registration message further comprises sending the registration message using a short message service. In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses sending a message using a short message service (paragraph 57, 61, 62). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow the registration process of HECKSEL to be transmitted using known and conventional transmission means. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 6, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the registration message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) message and the sending of the registration message further comprises sending the registration

message to a WAP server. In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses wherein a message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) message and sending of the message comprises sending a message to a WAP server (paragraph 57, 61, 62). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow the registration process of HECKSEL to be transmitted using known and conventional transmission means. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 8, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the sending of the registration message further comprises sending the registration message using a short message service (SMS). In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses sending of a comprises sending the message using a short message service (SMS) (paragraph 57, 61, 62). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow the registration process of HECKSEL to be transmitted using known and conventional transmission means. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device

and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 9, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the registration message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) message and the sending of the registration message further comprises sending the registration message to a WAP server. In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses wherein a message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) message and the sending of the message further comprises sending the message to a WAP server (paragraph 57, 61, 62). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow the registration process of HECKSEL to be transmitted using known and conventional transmission means. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 10, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the sending of the registration message further comprises sending the registration message using a short message service (SMS) (paragraph 57, 61, 62). In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses wherein sending of a message further

comprises sending the message using a short message service (SMS) (paragraph 57, 61, 62). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow the registration process of HECKSEL to be transmitted using known and conventional transmission means. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 11, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the registration message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) message and the sending of the registration message further comprises sending the registration message to a WAP server. In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses wherein a message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) message and the sending of the message further comprises sending the registration message to a WAP server (paragraph 57, 61, 62). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow the registration process of HECKSEL to be transmitted using known and conventional transmission means.

Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line

14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 20, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose receiving an acknowledgement message from the module registration system. In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses receiving an acknowledgement message from a module registration system (paragraph 59). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow a system to confirm access rights before allowing use of a module.

Regarding claim 26, HECKSEL discloses a device (abstract) comprising: a CPU processor (col. 3, line 44-60); a delivery means for sending messages over a network (col. 5, line 1-22); and a processor platform for controlling the operation of the mobile device (col. 3, line 44-60), the processing platform further comprising: at least one licensed software package including module parameters (Figures 3a-3c; col. 2, line 7-16, 24-42); and a module to allow use of the licensed software without eventually requiring permission from a server to use the at least one licensed software package (col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 15, col. 4, line 43-59; software registration is used to collect information on a user of a software product. Post registration activity can occur, however, is not necessary for use of registered product); a module handler operable to collect the module parameters and cause a registration message to be assembled in response to detecting the at least one licensed software package has been accessed by

Art Unit: 2617

a user, the registration message comprising a message for the server to record that the licensed software package has begun to be used in order to enable the registering of the at least one licensed software package (Figures 3a-3c; col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23); wherein the processing platform is further operable to cause the mobile device to send the registration message through the RF block to a module registration system at the server while allowing use of the licensed software package without requiring a response to the registration message (col. 4, line 16-30; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 23, col. 6, line 47-64). However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the delivery means is a radio frequency block for sending messages over a telecommunication network. In a similar field of endeavor, HURST discloses a radio frequency block for sending messages over a telecommunication network (paragraph 57, 61, 62). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of HURST, since such a modification would allow the registration process of HECKSEL to be transmitted using known and conventional transmission means. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 29, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further

discloses wherein the registration message is formatted for a short message service (SMS) (HURST - paragraph 57, 61, 62).

Regarding claim 30, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the registration message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) (HURST - paragraph 57, 61, 62).

Regarding claim 32, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the registration message is formatted for a short message service (SMS) (HURST - paragraph 57, 61, 62).

Regarding claim 33, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the registration message is a wireless application protocol (WAP) (HURST - paragraph 57, 61, 62).

Regarding claim 36, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses herein the module handler is operable to retrieve a stored value for the destination address from the module parameters, and wherein the module handler further comprises a default value for the destination address (HECKSEL - col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60; HURST - paragraph 45-48, 57-59).

Regarding claim 37, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further

discloses wherein the module handler is operable to retrieve a stored value for the destination address from the module parameters, and wherein the module handler further comprises a default value for the destination address (HECKSEL - col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60; HURST - paragraph 45-48, 57-59).

Regarding claim 38, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the module handler is operable to retrieve a stored value for the destination address from the module parameters, and wherein the module handler further comprises a default value for the destination address (HECKSEL - col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60; paragraph 45-48, 57-59).

Regarding claim 39, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the module handler is operable to retrieve a stored value for the destination address from the module parameters, and wherein the module handler further comprises a default value for the destination address (HECKSEL - col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60; HURST - paragraph 45-48, 57-59).

Regarding claim 43, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the processing platform is further operable to select a delivery path for the registration message based on a stored delivery path parameter for the mobile device (HECKSEL - col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60; HURST - paragraph 45-48, 57-59).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claim 44, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the module parameter further comprises a delivery path parameter (HECKSEL - col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60; HURST - paragraph 45-48, 57-59).

8. Claims 2 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HECKSEL et al (US 6,151,707) in view of COLVIN (US 2002/0162016 A1).

Regarding claim 2, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose encrypting the registration message prior to sending the registration message message. In a similar field of endeavor, COLVIN discloses encrypting the registration message prior to sending the registration message (paragraph 21). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of COLVIN, since such a modification would allow secure data transmission over a wireless medium.

Regarding claim 19, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose means for encrypting the registration message. In a similar field of endeavor, COLVIN discloses means for encrypting a registration message (paragraph 21). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HECKSEL to include the teachings of COLVIN, since such a modification would allow secure data transmission over a wireless medium.

9. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HECKSEL et al (US 6,151,707) in view of HURST et al (US 2003/0224823) and further in view of COLVIN (US 2002/0162016 A1)

Regarding claim 27, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of HECKSEL and HURST does not expressly disclose wherein the processor platform is further operable to cause encryption of the registration message prior to sending the registration message. In a similar field of endeavor, COLVIN discloses wherein a processor platform is further operable to cause encryption of a registration message prior to sending the registration message (paragraph 21). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of HECKSEL and HURST to include the teachings of COLVIN, since such a modification would allow secure data transmission over a wireless medium.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HECKSEL et al (US 6,151,707) in view of FREESE et al (US 5,148,472).

Regarding claim 7, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, HECKSEL does not expressly disclose wherein the registration message comprises a series of dual-tone-multi-frequency (DTMF) tones, the destination address is a telephone number, and the sending of the registration message further comprises making a telephone connection to the telephone number. FREESE discloses wherein a registration message comprises a series of

Art Unit: 2617

dual-tone-multi-frequency (DTMF) tones, a destination address is a telephone number, and the sending of the registration message further comprises making a telephone connection to the telephone number (col. 10, line 3-32). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of HECKSEL to include DTMF registration, as taught by FREESE, since such a modification would allow HECKSEL to use an established protocol format when communicating to a server. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

11. Claims 31 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HECKSEL et al (US 6,151,707) in view of HURST et al (US 2003/0224823) and further in view of FREESE et al (US 5,148,472).

Regarding claim 31, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of HECKSEL and HURST does not expressly disclose wherein the message comprises a series of dual-tone-multi-frequency (DTMF) tones and the destination address is a telephone number. FREESE discloses wherein a registration message comprises a series of dual-tone-multi-frequency (DTMF) tones and a destination address is a telephone number (col. 10, line 3-32). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of HECKSEL and

HURST to include DTMF registration, as taught by FREESE, since such a modification would allow the combination of HECKSEL to use an established protocol format when communicating to a server. Furthermore, HECKSEL further states the use of mobile devices (col. 3, line 47-50) and any suitable communication means between a remote device and a server (col. 5, line 14-23), and therefore, when using a wireless device, it would be an obvious design choice to also use a wireless communication means.

Regarding claim 40, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of HECKSEL and HURST further discloses wherein the module handler is operable to retrieve a stored value for the destination address from the module parameters, and wherein the module handler further comprises a default value for the destination address (HECKSEL - col. 4, line 31-59; col. 5, line 43-60; HURST - paragraph 45-48, 57-59).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ARIEL BALAOING whose telephone number is (571)272-7317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ariel Balaoing/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/A. B./ Examiner, Art Unit 2617